

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for consideration of the subject patent application. This amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed August 23, 2005. No prior art rejections were raised with respect to claims 23, 29, 32 and 33. Claims 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-34 and 36 were rejected. Applicant respectfully requests that this amendment after final be entered as it places the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests a telephone interview with the Examiner if any issues remain to allowance of the application.

Claims 19, 24, 26, 27, and 30-34 remain in the application. Claims 1-29 were originally presented. Claims 22, 23 28, 29, 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-18, 20, 21 and 25 were previously canceled. Claims 19, 24 and 30-34 have been amended.

Applicant notes that no prior art rejections were raised with respect to claims 23, 29, 32 and 33. Therefore, independent claim 19 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 23 (and to overcome § 112 issues). In addition, independent claim 24 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 29 (and to overcome § 112 issues). Furthermore, independent claim 32 has been amended to overcome § 112 issues. Similarly, independent claim 34 has been amended to overcome § 112 issues and to place it in condition for allowance similar to claims 19 and 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 34 and 36 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In order to place the claims in condition for allowance, Applicant has amended claim 34 (claim 36 has been canceled). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 is in condition for allowance. (In addition, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that the written description adequately describes to one skilled in the art that that fiber can be wrapped around the substantial enclosure in either a prepreg form, or by applying resin after or during wrapping. Paragraph 14 of the Office Action acknowledges such.)

Claims 19, 23, 27, 29-34 and 36 were rejected under § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that the term “another

fiber" in claims 19, 27, 30, 32 and 34 is unclear. Thus, the term has been amended for clarity. In addition, the Office Action alleged that the term "sheet" in claims 23, 29 and 36 is unclear. Thus, the term has been amended for clarity. Furthermore, the Office Action noted that the term "vessel" lacked antecedent basis in claim 34. Thus, the term was corrected. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Independent claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Otani.

As described above, independent claim 24 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 29.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable, and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19, 26, 27, 30 and 31 (including independent claim 19) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Otani in view of Martin.

As described above, independent claim 19 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 23. Therefore, independent claim 19 is allowable over the cited references, and dependent claims 26, 27 and 30 are allowable for at least their dependence on allowable independent claim 19.

Dependent claim 31 is allowable for at least its dependence on allowable claim 24.

(Applicant also notes that Otani and Martin fail to teach or suggest "removing the substantial enclosure with the bondable layer from the mold with a portion of the fibrous material of the bondable layer exposed", as recited in independent claim 19. Otani teaches that the item removed from the mold has an exterior of resin, not fibrous material. Martin also fails to teach removing a substantial enclosure from a mold with a fibrous material exposed.)

Independent claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Otani and Martin and further in view of Kersey.

As described above, independent claim 34 has been amended to be allowable similar to claims 19 and 24. Therefore, independent claim 34 is allowable.

(Applicant also notes that Otani, Martin and Kersey fail to teach or suggest “removing the substantial enclosure with the bondable layer from the mold with a portion of the fibrous material of the bondable layer exposed”, as recited in independent claim 34.)

Claims 19, 24, 26, 27, 30 and 31 (including independent claims 19 and 24) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Otani.

As described above, independent claim 19 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 23. Therefore, independent claim 19 is allowable over the cited references, and dependent claims 26, 27 and 30 are allowable for at least their dependence on allowable independent claim 19. (Applicant also notes that Otani and Martin fail to teach or suggest “removing the substantial enclosure with the bondable layer from the mold with a portion of the fibrous material of the bondable layer exposed”, as recited in independent claim 19. Otani teaches that the item removed from the mold has an exterior of resin, not fibrous material. Martin also fails to teach removing a substantial enclosure from a mold with a fibrous material exposed.)

As described above, independent claim 24 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 29. Therefore, independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited references, and dependent claim 31 is allowable for at least its dependence on allowable independent claim 24.

Independent claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Martin, Freeman '159, Freeman '771, and further in view of Kersey.

As described above, independent claim 34 has been amended to be allowable similar to claims 19 and 24. Therefore, independent claim 34 is allowable.

(Applicant also notes that Martin, Freeman '159, Freeman '77, and Kersey fail to teach or suggest “removing the substantial enclosure with the bondable layer from the mold with a portion of the fibrous material of the bondable layer exposed”, as recited in independent claim 34.)

Independent claim 34 and dependent claim 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Mack and Kersey.

As described above, independent claim 34 has been amended to be allowable similar to claims 19 and 24. Therefore, independent claim 34 is allowable.

(Applicant also notes that Martin, Mack, and Kersey fail to teach or suggest “removing the substantial enclosure with the bondable layer from the mold with a portion of the fibrous material of the bondable layer exposed”, as recited in independent claim 34.)

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 19, 24, 26, 27, and 30-34 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed and passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to call Garron M. Hobson at (801) 566-6633 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 20-0100.

DATED this 22 day of November, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Garron M. Hobson
Registration No. 41,073

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP
Customer No. 20,551
P.O. Box 1219
Sandy, Utah 84091-1219
Telephone: (801) 566-6633